DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 808 RC 009 483

AUTHOR Briggs, Vernon M.
TITLE Implications of Noninstitutional Considerations Upon the Effectiveness of Manpower Programs for Chicanos.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Center for the Study of Human Resources.
REPORT NO BEB-412
PUB DATE Jan 73
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Acculturation; Anglo Americans; *Cultural Differences; Cultural Factors; *Economically Disadvantaged; Economic Disadvantagement; *Economic Opportunities; *Employment Programs; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Ethnic Groups; Family Characteristics; Language; Manpower Development; Manpower Needs; Mexican Americans; Negroes; *Policy Formation; Social Characteristics; Socioeconomic Influences; Spanish Culture
IDENTIFIERS *Chicanos

ABSTRACT

Public policy has recognized the need to develop selective programs that zero in on the needs of specific racial subgroups (especially those Chicanos, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans of mixed racial backgrounds). However, entering the 1970's, the strategy of approaching social problems in terms of their impact upon subgroups has been politically attacked as being nationally divisive. Yet it remains highly doubtful that public policies designed to enhance the earning power of individuals (i.e., manpower programs focusing on the quantitative dimensions of labor supply as opposed to fiscal and monetary policies focusing on the quantitative dimensions of labor demand) can function successfully under any other economic mandate. The thesis that racial subgroups require special attention implies that there is a differential in the economic experience between the various subgroups. These unequal results are due either to barriers presented by the operations of society's institutions or to cultural and social characteristics of the subgroup which restrict easy assimilation into the larger society. This paper explores some of the effects that selective cultural and social characteristics (i.e., incidence of poverty, educational attainment, family characteristics, language) of Chicanos may exert upon the need for effective manpower policies. It is posited that there is a definite need for fragmented policy measures if assurances of equal economic opportunities are to be provided to all individuals in all racial subgroups. (Author/NQ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED130808

OCT 1976
ERIC/CP
RECEIVED

IMPLICATIONS OF NONINSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS UPON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS FOR CHICANOS

Vernon M. Briggs

January, 1973

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CENTER FOR THE STUDY
OF
HUMAN RESOURCES

BEB 412
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712

RC009483

IMPLICATIONS OF NONINSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS UPON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS FOR CHICANOS

Vernon M. Briggs

Ideally, the United States has sought to become a homogeneous nation composed of heterogeneous groups. To this end, traditional public policy measures for human resource development (e.g., the Morrill Act of 1862, the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, the open immigration policy until 1924, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, etc.) have had a general population mandate. Yet events of the post-World War II era have shown that, in many ways, America is a heterogeneous nation composed of homogeneous groups. Or, as Daniel Moynihan and Nathan Glazer would say, some groups are "beyond the melting pot."

The critical distinction as to who is assimilated and who is not is most vividly portrayed with respect to racial groups. Blacks, American Indians, and Spanish heritage Americans (especially those Chicanos, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans who are of mixed racial backgrounds) are disproportionately represented among the ranks of the economically disadvantaged. Orientals have been the exception to the general rule that minority group membership is an obstacle to economic well-being. But even Orientals remain largely excluded from mainstream America in a few racial enclaves in several large urban areas. Grudgingly, but of necessity, public policy has recognized the need to develop selective programs that zero in on

the needs of specific racial subgroups. The manpower programs of the 1960's represent a manifestation of this quest.

Entering the 1970's, however, the strategy of approaching social problems in terms of their impact upon subgroups has come under political attack as being nationally divisive. Yet it remains highly doubtful that public policies designed to enhance the earning power of individuals (i.e., manpower programs that focus on the qualitative dimensions of labor supply as opposed to fiscal and monetary policies that focus on the quantitative dimensions of labor demand) can function successfully under any other economic mandate. The serious economic problems of the United States are unlikely to be found from a reading of aggregate averages. Such barometers often conceal more than they reveal.

The thesis that racial subgroups require special attention implies that there is a differential in the economic experience between the various subgroups that compose the American society. These unequal results are due either to barriers presented by the operations of society's institutions or to cultural and social characteristics of the subgroup which restrict easy assimilation into the larger society. In an early study, the author examined the adverse effects that rural Chicanos have encountered with institutions and institutional practices.[1] The present paper seeks to explore some of the effects that selective cultural and social characteristics of Chicanos may exert upon the need for effective manpower policies. It is likely, of course, that both considerations are important. Hence, the paper is not an effort to refute one explanation as opposed to the other. Rather, it is to posit the probability that there is a definite need for fragmented policy measures if assurances of equal economic opportunities are to be provided to all individuals in all racial subgroups.

Existence of Racial Group Differences

Incidence of Poverty

One of the most pervasive characteristics of the Chicano population is its high incidence of poverty. In 1960, 32.8 percent of the Chicano population in the Southwest (or 1,082,000 persons in families) were "officially" classified as being poor.[2] The 1960 figures underestimated the actual poverty population because they are for family people only -- excluding persons living as individuals. For Chicanos (the only racial group in the United States in which the number of males exceeds the number of females in the population), the exclusion seriously understates the true story of the poverty population.

By 1970, the absolute number of Chicanos in the Southwest living in the "official" state of poverty was 1,230,000 persons in families.[3] In relative terms, the percentage of all Chicano family persons living in poverty declined slightly, to 29.4 percent of the total. For 1970, the figures for unrelated individuals are available. They disclose that in the Southwest, 34.5 percent (or 53,000 persons) of the Chicanos who were so classified were living in poverty. Thus, with almost one out of every three Chicanos "officially" living in a state of poverty and countless thousands more just barely over the statistically defined threshold, poverty is an ongoing and pervasive fact of Chicano life in the United States. The comparable poverty incidence figures in 1970 for Anglos and blacks were 9.8 percent and 33.6 percent, respectively.

Low Educational Attainment

In addition to a high incidence of poverty, extremely low levels of educational attainment are a special characteristic of the Chicano population. In 1960, the census reported for persons 14 years and over inthe Southwest that the median level years of school completion were 12.0 for Anglos, 9.7 for nonwhites, and 8.1 for Chicanos. The question of educational quality, of course, is even more important (especially for children of migratory workers), and it is left moot by the statistics. The lowest state median was in Texas, with 4.8 years for Chicanos over 25 years of age, and the highest was for California, with 8.6 years. No major racial group in America produces fewer high school graduates. In addition, only 6 percent of the Chicano population had any college training (compared to 12 percent for nonwhites and 25 percent for Anglos). The functional illiteracy rate (zero to four years of schooling) for Chicanos of 27.6 percent in 1960 was seven times that of Anglos and twice that of blacks.

A 1969 study of persons of Spanish origin indicated a trend toward a bimodal distribution with respect to educational experience within the Mexican origin group. There were significant differences in the educational attainment of persons 35 years and over from those persons 25 to 34 years. The median level for the former was 7.3 years; for the latter, it was 10.8 years. These figures indicate that although improvements are occurring, the Mexican origin group was still significantly below (for both the over 35 and the 25-34 group) the comparable educational attainment medians for the entire Spanish origin grouping (11.7 years and 8.5 years, respectively). It is also certain that the

Chicano figures remain below those of Anglos and nonwhites even if allowances are made for differences between younger and older experiences.

In 1971 and 1972, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights released three exhaustive reports of its investigations of Chicago educational experience in the Southwest. In its evaluation, the commission concluded that relative to their Anglo student counterparts, "their school holding power is lower; their reading achievement is poorer; their repetition of grades is more frequent; and they participate in extracurricular activities to a lesser degree."[4] The thrust of the commission's findings was that Chicanos were significantly isolated in de facto segregated schools and that they suffered severely from "cultural exclusion" with respect to curriculum, textbooks, and instructional methods.[5] To enhance the retention power of the schools, the commission recommended extensive reliance upon bilingual education and the addition of course materials which relate the Chicano heritage and contribution to the cultural development of the region.

Family Characteristics

In contrast to Anglos and blacks, Chicano families tend to be larger and younger (see Table 1). As a result, the number of Chicano wives who are able to work either some time during the year or full time during the year is considerably less than that of either Anglos or blacks (see Table 2). With respect to female-headed households, the incidence is far less for Chicanos than among blacks, but when it does occur, the chances are few that the Chicano woman will be a labor force participant (see Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1

Selected Family Characteristics
of Major Racial Groups
in the United States, 1970

Family Characteristics	Total Population	Anglo	Black	Chicano*
Total families	51,168,599	45,770,351	4,863,401	1,333,372
Percent with female head	10.8	9.0	27.4	12.8
Percent with own children under 18 years old	55.3	54.5	61.0	70.7
Percent with own children under 6 years old	25.9	25.5	30.9	40.3
Mean size of family	3.56	3.49	4.11	4.29**

*Figures are for Chicanos who live in the five Southwestern states (California, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas).

**This figure only is for all Spanish heritage Americans (i.e., Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and others), although Chicanos dominate the group.

SOURCE: Manpower Report of the President, 1973.

Table 2

Selected Social Characteristics
of Major Racial Groups
in the United States, 1970

Family Status	Anglo	Black	Chicano
Persons in husband-wife families	38,677	2,922	822
Husbands (percent) who worked at some time during the year	89.9	88.8	91.8
Husbands (percent) who worked full time year-round	69.3	62.2	61.8
Wives (percent) who worked some time during the year	50.0	63.3	38.9
Wives (percent) who worked full time year-round	20.0	28.1	11.0
Female family heads (percent) who worked some time during the year	61.0	61.7	54.3
Female family heads (percent) who worked full time year-round	34.2	26.0	23.7

SOURCE: Manpower Report of the President, 1973.

As for husbands, it is of interest to note that Chicano men are more likely to have worked at some time during the year than are Anglo or black males. Yet, as Table 2 also shows, they are the least likely of the three racial groups to work full time year-round. The explanation for the low year-round work figure for Chicano husbands is likely to be due to their inordinately high concentration in agricultural employment.

Explanations for Chicano Group Differences

Language

The factor most often cited as the cause for the relatively unfavorable educational performance of Chicanos is the language issue. In 1969, it was reported that in families of Mexican origin, Spanish was the "language usually spoken in the home" in 47.3 percent of the families. It is likely that the incidence is higher in rural than in urban areas. The limited exposure that many Chicano youngsters have to English often becomes an issue of conflict when the youths begin school. Enrique Hank Lopez has synthesized the issue:

> Many of us are not really bilingual but schizolingual. We actually speak an amalgam of English and Spanish that creates special problems in education. For every human being, the greatest period of learning is from birth to age five and for the Chicano child that learning is taking place in this schizolingual amalgam, which is mostly Spanish. This is the child's principal cognitive tool but the day he enters school it is snatched away from him. You may as well perform a partial lobotomy on him. He's so severely traumatized at a crucial period in kindergarten. When he's forbidden to talk his own language, he gets a terrific sense of inferiority and guilt. He begins to dislike himself and his parents and everyone else.[6]

Nonetheless, one of the most characteristic aspects of the labor market experience of Chicanos is the group's ability to demonstrate higher earnings than any other non-Anglo group at comparable levels of educational attainment. Relative to Anglos, however, Chicanos have not received equivalent returns.[7]

Culture

It was perhaps the major finding of the 1970 report by the UCLA Mexican Study Project that Chicanos are being assimilated into the general population and that cultural differences were rapidly receding.[8] The researchers concluded that "the data point unequivocally in the direction of integration."[9] The project's findings dismiss the contentions of many Chicano spokesmen (especially the militant ones) and of the considerable accumulated social science literature that contends that there is a cultural distinctiveness, because the statements are too generalized and the findings "suffer from the deficiencies of the basic research data."[10]

The issue of whether or not there exist cultural differences which may explain differential economic results is of vital significance to policy makers. In rejecting the need for specific programs for Chicanos based upon the existence of alleged "cultural and especially language distinctiveness," the UCLA project warns that "there is a danger that policy at the national and local levels may be formulated from the simplistic popular versions"[11] of findings that contend that important differences exist. Apparently, however, the UCLA researchers were not as sure of their conclusion as some of their statements might indicate, as they hedge their bet with the summary view that

"our analysis makes it clear that ethnic culture perhaps more than any other area warrants continuing intensive research."[12]

The basis upon which the UCLA study drew its conclusion was two questionnaires that sampled the Chicano populations of San Antonio, Texas, and Los Angeles, California. Both cities have large Chicano populations. The questionnaires sought to uncover any prevailing cultural differences between Chicanos and Anglos with respect to their perception of work rewards and to their relationship with their environment. Strangely, however, the questionnaires were administered only to Chicanos. Hence, what was actually tested was not whether cultural differences exist between Anglos and Chicanos; rather, the test examined Anglo notions of what attitudes Chicanos have with respect to a list of stereotyped cultural impressions. The UCLA group concluded that the notions of the Anglo researchers were similar to those of the Chicano respondents; hence, the conclusion that no cultural differences exist.

For example, with respect to employment rewards, one response indicated the fact that 63 percent of the Chicano interviewees from middle-income groups and 45 percent from low-income groups felt that their children should aspire for professional careers. This led the UCLA team to conclude that Chicano parents are not inclined to channel their children into menial jobs. Hence, it is inferred that the finding is similar to what might exist for Anglos.

With regard to cultural perceptions of their environment, a series of stereotyped statements concerning passive views of people vis-à-vis their environment and the degree of reliance upon the assistance and support of relatives was asked. Again, the responses led the

researchers to infer that the answers would be similar to what Anglos would say. Hence, the conclusion: "Mexican Americans do not appear to possess distinctively traditional values of the kind frequently attributed to them."[13]

A careful review of the questions asked leaves many unanswered questions. In almost every incidence, it is possible to reason equally persuasively that the findings had little to do with the basic contention of the UCLA study that the responses show no ethnic differences. Regardless of the interpretations, however, the fact remains that because no comparable Anglo group was questioned, there is no comparison along racial or ethnic lines. Hence, the UCLA study does not conclusively prove its case.

Thus, one is left with "a large body of literature" which has stressed the cultural distinctiveness of Chicanos. The UCLA criticisms of this repository of wisdom may be valid -- i.e., that most have dealt with Chicanos in isolated settings or are badly outdated -- but the question is still open as to the actual existence of cultural distinctiveness and, if so, the possible significance of such a finding.

Specific Ethnic Factors of the Chicano Population

Although the issue of cultural distinctiveness remains controversial to many, it is emerging as a central factor to the evolutionary development of manpower policy. The importance of cultural differences has long been stressed by anthropologists, but it is only in recent years that the issue has aroused serious interest for economists concerned

with labor market policies. To speak of such matters does run the risk of perpetuating false stereotypes. Yet, it is a greater wrong to deny differences if they exist. Discussions of reality should reflect reality.

The chairman of the President's Committee on Opportunities for Spanish Speaking People, Henry Ramirez, wrote in 1972 that "the Spanish speaking have a strong sense of cultural uniqueness, coupled with feelings akin to outrage that the broader society has failed to recognize, accept, or even place a positive value on their contribution to the diverse fabric of American society."[14] The most obvious of the cultural differences is the resiliency of the Spanish language. Of all of the languages that have been associated with the various ethnic groups that historically composed the United States, it is Spanish that has the greatest probability of persevering as a second language in the nation. Spanish was spoken in the Southwestern continental area that is now the United States long before English. Moreover, the proximity of Mexico to the Southwest affords continual opportunities for its cultural importance to be recharged.

There are, however, other cultural factors that are less obvious than language but still demanding of attention. Among these, according to Ramirez, are:[15]

> (1) Relations between individuals are more important than competitive, materialistic, or achievement norms.
> (2) Strong family ties.
> (3) A sense of solidarity and pride in a unique heritage (sometimes referred to as "la raza").
> (4) Machismo, meaning male dominance, patriarchy, and emphasis on masculinity.
> (5) Aspirations for professional rather than business or managerial occupations.

Relatedly, there was a comprehensive study completed in 1972 of the relevance of manpower programs to the Chicano population of San Antonio, Texas.[16] In the course of the work, extensive interviews were conducted with staff personnel of the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) and the Texas Employment Commission (TEC). The interviewees were asked to respond to a series of questions concerning cultural distinctiveness, if any, of the largely Chicano population they serve. Fifty-eight percent of the officials responded affirmatively to the question, "Do you find there to be any significant differences between low-income Anglos, Chicanos, and blacks?" Of the respondents, those who were Chicano themselves were the most avid in the claim that such differences do occur (i.e., 75 percent of the Chicano interviewees said such differences exist, while only 60 percent of the black interviewees and only 46 percent of the Anglo interviewees did).[17]

Significance of Cultural Differences as a Factor for Manpower Policy

The concerted effort to develop a manpower policy for the United States began in the 1960's. The major pillar of this effort is the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and its many subsequent amendments. The considerations, however, that led to the passage of this major piece of legislation had little to do directly with Chicanos. As the deputy director of the CEP in San Antonio has observed:

> Take MDTA [Manpower Development and Training Act] institutional training. It uses guidelines which were developed on the east coast for Anglo and black communities. The educational standards are too high. MDTA wants

> people who are functioning at the seventh or eighth grade level. In my area, migrants and other poor Chicanos have great difficulty meeting such standards.[18]

Related to the fact that the low average levels of educational attainment artificially restrict Chicano participation by the very people who need the programs the most is the language issue. Frequently, if it is possible to overcome the educational barriers, the language obstacle arises. As a migrant worker specialist to the governor of Illinois stated: "The programs they set up, however, have Anglo teachers who, although certified by the school board, know nothing at all of the basic methodology of English as a second language or of the way our people think and see the world."[19]

Language is not **only** an instructional barrier to many Chicanos, it can also be an obstacle to access to programs through testing requirements. For many low-income people with poverty income and low educational attainment backgrounds, the U.S. Training and Employment Service has developed a nonreading aptitude test battery. It is designed to test people who have low or no reading ability. It is administered, however, in English. An effort is being made to offer a Spanish edition, but even this may be of limited help. For as one official stated,

> ...when it is translated the Spanish is likely to be Castilian, a very pure form. It's a language that may be used at the Washington level, but it's not used in the barrios of San Antonio. We communicate in what some people call Tex-Mex, but which I appropriately call American Spanish. The Manpower Administration sent us a test translation that was being used in New York City, and we found it was just as invalid as though it were in English.[20]

Likewise, it has been noted by officials close to many programs that numerous low-income Chicanos are functionally illiterate <u>both</u> in

English and Spanish. Hence, the traditional 16 weeks allowed for most special pre-MDTA classes is often insufficient to overcome such handicaps.[21]

Another distinctive cultural factor of Chicanos is the relatively stronger family ties and the issue of male dominance. No program has demonstrated the strength of these ties more than the unsatisfactory operations of the Job Corps. Again, Job Corps was set up under the assumption that the common bonds of poverty between all people living in poverty were stronger than any specific cultural differences between component groups. As a result, one spokesman observed in 1972:

> The Job Corps, like most of the nation's programs and institutions, was developed by and for English-speaking Americans. No program was established for Spanish-speaking youth, and the only centers specifically designated to serve them were five in Puerto Rico, three of which were closed in 1969.[22]

As Job Corps' most unique feature is its 24-hour residential nature, the issue of relocation caused recruitment difficulties. The issue was especially severe for Chicano women. Many families were quite reluctant to allow their daughters to leave home and their community to move to a distant training site.[23] Likewise, many daughters were reluctant to leave their families. For those who do participate, it is often implicit that the graduates will be trained for jobs that are unavailable in their home towns, so that permanent relocation is a probable outcome.

As with institutional MDTA programs, the Job Corps also has had its problems with the language issue. In some instances, the lack of familiarity with English caused Chicanos to drop out early from the

program or to postpone their vocational instruction until after they learned sufficient English to benefit from the instruction.

To overcome these belatedly recognized cultural barriers, the Job Corps began in late 1970 to diversify its operations. Four national Job Corps centers were designated the responsibility of developing special programs for the Spanish speaking. They were the women's centers in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and Drums, Pennsylvania, and the men's centers in San Marcos, Texas, and Edinburg, Indiana. The San Marcos and Albuquerque centers have the most important responsibilities for Chicanos. In addition, three new local residential centers for young men have been established in the barrios of El Paso, Phoenix, and San Jose. In these centers, Job Corps is moving toward complete bilingual instruction, but it also continues to teach English to Spanish-speaking corpsmen. As for the problems with family ties for women, the Albuquerque program has sought to alleviate some of the family fears. To ease the relocation transition, the women's center has signed contracts with 17 YWCA centers in various Southwestern cities that provide Job Corps graduates with work experience and a sheltered living situation. To overcome the hesitancy of many families, recruiters now "explain in detail what the center is like, show slides of the center, and take Spanish-speaking corpswomen along on the recruiting talks."[24] Also, recruiters have found that "many families feel more comfortable if two daughters enroll together."[25] Accordingly, it is now an objective to recruit two or three daughters from the same family when such a circumstance permits.

It is also significant to note that the Job Corps has, since its inception, been noted for its willingness to innovate in its educational methodology. Thus, it is not really surprising that it should be in the vanguard in the development and implementation of instructional materials and supportive services tailored to the needs of Chicanos. In late 1972, the National Spanish Speaking Management Association, a nonprofit corporation established to assist Spanish-speaking groups participate in manpower programs, was awarded a contract to implement a completely bilingual and multi-cultural program for the aforementioned designated Job Corps centers to service the Spanish speaking. The program it has devised provides for teaching in Spanish with English language progressively introduced as learning advances. Also, the curriculum contains courses in the history and culture of Chicanos for both the corpsmen and the instructional staff.

Turning to another cultural characteristic, the failure to appreciate the machismo phenomenon has caused some unnecessary problems to the migrant program known as the "Last Yellow Bus" (now officially known as the National Migrant Program). To qualify for participation, two members of each migrant family must become training participants. It is reported that in Laredo, Texas, there has been much dissatisfaction over what is seemingly an insignificant practice. Namely, each member of the family is paid the same training allowance and separate checks are made out in the name of each participant. It is said that it is a cause of "great discontent" for the male head to be paid the same as his wife or his son or his daughter. It is an additional affront to the male head for the money to be paid separately, since he no longer appears to be the main breadwinner. The topic appears

minor on its surface, and in a day of equal rights, the prevailing practice appears quite fair. It is to be recalled, however, that the primary objective of the program is to attract and to hold migrant workers for vocational skill training that may enable them to break away from the migrant stream. If, as noted by Ramirez earlier, machismo is a cultural trait and if patriarchy does characterize family life, then these financial practices may operate against the prospects for success of the program.[26]

There has been one program that has long recognized the fact that Chicanos are a distinct racial and cultural group whose manpower needs deserve a unique approach. This program is Operation SER (standing for Service, Employment, and Redevelopment; it is also the infinitive for the Spanish verb "to be"). Financed mainly by grants from the U.S. Department of Labor, SER is administered by two established Chicano organizations: the American GI Forum and the League of United Latin American Citizens. As to its mission, it has been synthesized thus: "...there is no national formula for SER. Instead, it shapes programs around local needs and resources."[27]

Beginning in 1965 as a volunteer job placement service for Chicanos in Houston and Corpus Christi, it has expanded steadily in size and function. During 1972, SER operated in 29 cities whose operations trained and placed 2,500 enrollees while directly placing in jobs another 2,800 people who did not need formal training. Its budget for 1972 was $9.5 million. In early 1973, it was announced that the budget for SER will be almost doubled, to a figure of $18 million. The increased budget will allow an expansion in the number of cities

served to 38 and an increase in the number of people trained and placed in each locality. Most of the expanded effort will be in the two states in which Chicanos are most heavily concentrated: California (which will have 11 SER programs) and Texas (which will have 10 SER programs). Yet in addition to programs in the remaining Southwestern states, SER will be introduced into other areas of the nation in which pockets of Chicano workers (usually fallouts from the migrant farm labor force) have developed. Hence some of these new programs will be in Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and Washington.

Although it is difficult to generalize about the activities of SER, since its program design is multiple in purposes, it has assumed a special concern with illiteracy in both Spanish and English. All SER staffs are bilingual. Counseling, occupational training, and employment placement assistance are key features. All SER operations have an "informal working agreement" witn their respective state employment services.

In addition to the bilingual features, there are other aspects of SER that seem to justify its case for a separate identity. For example, there is often a need to provide naturalization information for permanent U.S. residents who are not citizens. Relatedly, these same people often need information about driver's licenses, consumer credit practices, legal assistance, medical clinics, and community organizations that American citizens would frequently know as a result of their daily activities. Thus, it can be genuinely summaried that:

> By now SER has piled up a great amount of expertise in manpower. It has blended its intimate knowledge of the language, culture, and outlook of people in low-income Spanish-speaking communities with manpower program technology and it has discovered what works in the barrios, what doesn't work -- and why.[28]

Conclusions

Testifying before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress in early 1972, Vicente Ximenes commented upon the proposed economic agenda for the nation for the year as follows: "I see very little in the budget or in the economic report that is going to change the employment patterns for the Spanish speaking of the nation."[29] Given the fact that the era of quantitative expansion of manpower programs is waning, more attention will be directed toward qualitative accomplishments. In this light, awareness of the need to tailor programs to the special cultural attributes may provide the success stories that will enable future expansions to occur to meet the universe of need to which Ximenes alludes.

The manpower policy needs of Chicanos are immense. The realization that these needs are distinct from those of other racial groups has been belated, but it does represent a step forward for public policy. The premise behind the development of a panoply of manpower programs has been the belief that diverse groups of people have diverse needs. In the present instance, it is clear that Chicanos do require special programs that are cognizant of their unique cultural attributes.

Data that compare the payoffs to education and training of respective racial groups which separate the Spanish speaking as a distinct group are quite limited. Those studies that are available, however, are unanimous in their conclusions: returns to investment in the development of the employment potential of Chicanos are higher than those for blacks and, in some instances, even for Anglos.[30] Too often program data in the past for Chicanos have been lumped into those for whites. Since 1970, however, the Manpower Administration has reconstructed its reporting system so that data on the Spanish speaking can be obtained and the white figure adjusted to become an Anglo figure. Similar reporting changes have been made by the respective state employment services. Consequently, it will soon be possible to be more certain as to the benefits of providing manpower services to Chicanos.

The need to design special programs for Chicanos and to build flexibility into other general population programs so as to be sensitive to their unique cultural attributes can increase the benefits to Chicano enrollees in the future. Such changes, in combination with concerted efforts to eliminate institutional practices and discriminatory activities which can obstruct the successful performance of even the best designed and most efficiently administered programs, portend the prospect for opening opportunities for significant numbers of Chicano workers.

A review of the scant contemporary literature and anecdotes on the issue of cultural differences as an economic variable lead one to concur with the UCLA project's aforementioned conclusion that ethnic culture deserves more research attention than perhaps any other single area of inquiry. For, as an earlier comprehensive study concluded:

> Economists have rarely focused on the relationship of cultural values to employment patterns, probably because most regard this as a sociological problem and therefore out of their jurisdiction, but it is certain that the model of a coldly rational income-maximizing worker, so familiar in economic theory, bears little resemblance to reality.[31]

More attention to the study of the relationship of ethnic culture to the income and employment determination process is certainly in order.

FOOTNOTES

1. Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., Chicanos and Rural Poverty (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973).

2. Leo Grebler et al., The Mexican American People (New York: Free Press, 1970), p. 198.

3. "Characteristics of the Low-Income Population, 1970," Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 81 (1971), p. 50.

4. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, The Unfinished Education, Report II of the Mexican American Educational Series (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, October, 1971), pp. 41-42.

5. In addition to the above cited report, the commission's findings are presented in Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest, Report I (April, 1971), and The Excluded Student, Report III (May, 1972), which are the remaining volumes in the series.

6. Steven V. Roberts, "5 Percent in U.S. Cite Spanish Origin," New York Times (August 18, 1971), p. 66.

7. Walt Fogel, "The Effect of Low Educational Attainment on Incomes: A Comparative Study of Selected Ethnic Groups," Journal of Human Resources (Fall, 1966), pp. 22-40.

8. Grebler, op. cit., Chapters 16 and 18.

9. Ibid., p. 399.

10. Ibid., p. 438.

11. Ibid., p. 439.

12. Ibid. Emphasis supplied.

13. Ibid., p. 438.

14. Henry M. Ramirez, "America's Spanish-Speaking: A Profile," Manpower (September, 1972), p. 33.

15. Ibid., p. 34.

16. Tim D. Kane, "The Effect of Labor Market Change upon the Employment of Low-Income Mexican Americans: The San Antonio Experience," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin (1972).

17. Tim D. Kane, "Cultural Differences between Mexican Americans and Anglos: A Review of the Empirical Evidence," unpublished and undated material supplied by Professor Kane to the author.

18. "A Piece of the Action," Manpower (September, 1971), p. 10. This is a printed dialogue between four Spanish-speaking Americans who discuss the manpower needs of their people.

19. Ibid., p. 11.

20. Ibid., pp. 12-13.

21. Ibid., p. 12.

22. Gloria Stevenson, "The Job Corps Learns Spanish," Manpower (September, 1972), p. 7.

23. E.g., see Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., Negro Employment in the South: The Houston Labor Market, Manpower Research Monograph 23, Vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1971), p. 87. Although primary attention of this monograph is directed toward black employment problems, frequent comparisons with Chicanos are also included. See also Stevenson, op. cit., p. 12.

24. Stevenson, op. cit., p. 12.

25. Ibid.

26. Personal interviews conducted by the author in Laredo, Texas, in April, 1972, with officials of the South Texas Development Council.

27. Patricia Marshall, "A Chance To Be," Manpower (September, 1972), p. 17.

28. Ibid., p. 18.

29. "Statement by Vicente T. Ximenes, Vice President of the National Urban Coalition, before the Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Congress" (February 23,1972), p. 11 (mimeographed material).

30. Fogel, op. cit.; also see MDT Outcomes Study: Final Report (Santa Ana, California: Decision Making Information, 1972).

31. Paul Bullock, "Employment Problems of the Mexican American" in John H. Burma (ed.), Mexican Americans in the United States (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1970), p. 149.